

MINUTES OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
TRANSPORTATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

February 28, 2008

Maricopa Association of Governments Office  
302 North First Avenue, Suite 200, Saguaro Room  
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Phoenix: Tom Callow  
ADOT: Floyd Roehrich  
Avondale: David Fitzhugh  
#Buckeye: Scott Lowe  
Chandler: RJ Zeder for Patrice Kraus  
#El Mirage: Lance Calvert  
\*Fountain Hills: Randy Harrel  
\*Gila Bend: Lynn Farmer  
\*Gila River: David White  
Gilbert: Stephanie Prybyl for Tami Ryall  
Glendale: Terry Johnson  
Goodyear: Cato Esquivel  
Guadalupe: Jim Ricker  
Litchfield Park: Mike Cartsonis

Maricopa County: John Hauskins  
Mesa: Scott Butler  
\*Paradise Valley: Robert M. Cicarelli  
Peoria: David Moody  
Queen Creek: Mark Young  
RPTA: Bob Antilla for Bryan Jungwirth  
Scottsdale: David Meinhart for  
Mary O'Connor  
Surprise: Randy Overmyer  
Tempe: Carlos de Leon  
Valley Metro Rail: Wulf Grote for John  
Farry  
Youngtown: Lloyce Robinson

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ATTENDING

\*Regional Bicycle Task Force: Randi  
Alcott, RPTA  
\*Street Committee: Darryl Crossman, City  
of Litchfield Park

\*Pedestrian Working Group: Eric Iwersen,  
City of Tempe  
\*ITS Committee: Mike Mah

\* Members neither present nor represented by proxy. + - Attended by Videoconference  
# - Attended by Audioconference

OTHERS PRESENT

Eric Anderson, MAG  
Dean Giles, MAG  
Roger Herzog, MAG  
Kyunghwi Jeon, MAG  
Sarath Joshua, MAG  
Vladimir Livshits, MAG  
Nathan Pryor, MAG  
Roger Roy, MAG  
Steve Tate, MAG  
Lavanya Vallabhaneni, MAG

Eileen O. Yazzie, MAG  
Diane Arnst, ADEQ  
Tami Ryall, Town of Gilbert  
Greg Montes, City of Glendale  
Brent Stoddard, City of Mesa  
Tom Remes, City of Phoenix  
Arun Kuppam, Cambridge Systematics  
Jack Lynch, Olsson Associates  
Paul Ward, Olsson Associates  
Kwi-Sung Kang, ADOT

1. Call to Order

Mr. Tom Callow from the City of Phoenix called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m.

2. Approval of January 31, 2008 Draft Minutes

Mr. Callow asked if there were any changes or amendments to the meeting minutes. Mr. Scott Lowe from the Town of Buckeye requested that the minutes be revised to reflect Mr. Steve Borst's attendance for Mr. Lowe via audio-visual conference at the January Committee meeting. Mr. Dave Meinhart from the City of Scottsdale moved to approve the minutes with the requested revisions, and Mr. John Hauskins from Maricopa County seconded. The minutes were subsequently approved by unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

3. Call to the Audience

Mr. Callow asked if any cards requesting to speak on any item not included in the Committee's agenda had been submitted. None had been received, and Mr. Callow moved on to the next item on the agenda.

4. Transportation Director's Report

Mr. Eric Anderson, the MAG Transportation Director, presented the Transportation Director's Report. The first item on Mr. Anderson's report was Regional Area Road Fund (RARF) revenues. Mr. Anderson informed the Committee that January RARF revenues had decreased seven percent from January 2007 and were 11 percent lower than forecasted for the month. Mr. Anderson remarked that this decrease was the largest to date. He also informed the Committee that year-to-date RARF revenues were down 1.2 percent below the previous year and 4.4 percent lower than forecasted.

Next, Mr. Anderson announced that the Regional Council adopted the revised Highway Acceleration Policy at the January 30<sup>th</sup> meeting. He added that the revised policy should be an improvement over the previous policy. Mr. Anderson informed the Committee that the first exercise of the revised policy would occur in March with the City of Peoria advancing the widening of the Union Hills interchange bridge. According to Mr. Anderson, the City of Peoria applied for a Help Loan from the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) that had tentatively been approved. The estimated cost for the project is \$10 million.

The final item on the Transportation Director's Report was Building a Quality Arizona (BQAZ) and the status of a potential statewide vote. He stated he would be meeting with ADOT and a representative from the Governor's Office for a monthly status report meeting and announced that ADOT had launched all the BQAZ framework studies throughout the state.

Mr. Anderson reported that he had received numerous inquiries about a statewide vote. Discussions on a potential vote have included whether to hold a vote in November 2008 or 2009, revenue sources, types of projects and the division of projects geographically and by mode. According to Mr. Anderson, several of these issues have not been addressed yet, which would make a vote in November, in his opinion, practically impossible. He continued adding that a statewide initiative would also be unlikely due to the number of signatures required.

Mr. Callow asked the Committee if there were any questions or comments about Mr. Anderson's report. There were none, and this concluded the Transportation Directors' Report.

#### 5. CMAQ Funded Projects in the MAG 2008-2012 TIP

Mr. Callow invited Ms. Eileen Yazzie from MAG to present on Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funded projects in the MAG 2008 -2012 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Ms. Yazzie provided a brief history of the Energy Independence and Security Act, which was signed in December 2007 and established an 80 percent minimum match requirement for CMAQ funds. She announced that since the Committee meeting in January, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) released an action memo to local offices, which implemented the requirement as of December 20, 2007. Ms. Yazzie reported that currently obligated projects are not affected by this change. She noted that currently there are three projects obligated by ADOT that have not been authorized by FHWA because the projects did not meet the 80 percent minimum match.

Ms. Yazzie reported that once MAG became aware of the issue on January 28, 2008, MAG staff had been analyzing two strategies to address the issue: a legislative effort and a reprogramming effort. Ms. Yazzie then invited Mr. Nathan Pryor from MAG to brief the Committee about a potential legislative fix. Mr. Anderson interjected that MAG staff had inquired if the 80 percent match could be achieved by using other federal funds, such as STP-MAG funds, and had been informed that the mixing of funds for this purpose was not allowed.

Mr. Pryor stated that MAG had been working with the Arizona Congressional Delegation on a legislative fix to the issue. He stated that Congressmen Harry Mitchell, Ed Pastor, and John Shadegg from Arizona had been briefed on the situation and the impact to the MAG region. Mr. Pryor reported that Congressman Mitchell's office had potentially identified two approaches that included exemption and/or grandfather language. Mr. Pryor also reported that Congressman Mitchell's office was attempting to identify bills moving through the US House of Representatives as potential vehicles for the language.

Mr. Callow inquired how grandfather language might work and if it would cover projects currently programmed in the TIP. Mr. Pryor explained that the options are in the early stages of development and that precise language had not been determined at this time. Mr. Anderson explained that MAG is in a unique position because of the management and size of our CMAQ Program. Mr. Wulf Grote from Valley Metro expressed concern about the impact the match requirement would have on projects programmed outside the current TIP.

Mr. Callow asked if there were any additional questions or comments about the update provided by Mr. Pryor. There were none, and Mr. Callow invited Ms. Yazzie to continue with her

presentation. Before continuing, Ms. Yazzie explained that due to timing, MAG staff is concurrently working on multiple approaches to this issue due to timing. She added that waiting for a legislative fix that may not occur would cause a significant setback if reprogramming of CMAQ projects was required.

Ms. Yazzie informed the Committee that the current provision only applies to projects programmed in 2008 and 2009 and that the impact to projects programmed in 2010 - 2012 were unknown at this point. Mr. Anderson cautioned that discussions at the federal level indicated the provisions may be extended to future projects, particularly if the provision was included in a reauthorization bill. Ms. Yazzie continued explaining the 80 percent match requirement applies to actual not estimated project costs. As a result, MAG would need to revise applications to require more detailed project cost information. She mentioned that one option would be to create a 10 percent contingency fund for CMAQ projects to address project cost increases.

Ms. Yazzie stated that over 70 percent of projects programmed in the 2008-2012 TIP did not meet the match requirements. She then provided an update on the status of local sponsored CMAQ projects programmed in the 2008 - 2012 TIP. Of the 164 projects programmed, 149 do not meet the 80 percent match requirement. This includes 27/28 air quality projects; 28/33 bicycle projects; 56/61 Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) projects; 29/32 pedestrian projects; and 9/10 street projects.

Ms. Yazzie explained the street projects were included prior to the development of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Mr. David Moody from the City of Peoria asked if projects, which were funded in the past and carried over, would be affected by the new provisions. Ms. Yazzie explained that according to the FHWA, the provisions applied to CMAQ projects at the time of obligation not funding.

Next, Ms. Yazzie reported that 22 of 75 MAG, ADOT, and transit projects programmed do not meet the 80 percent match. The distribution of projects included 1/28 air quality projects; 6/6 bicycle projects; 7/21 ITS projects; 1/1 pedestrian project; and 7/18 transit projects. Ms. Yazzie reported that none of the freeway projects were impacted by this issue.

Ms. Yazzie directed the Committee's attention to a handout on projects programmed in 2008. The handout illustrated that of the local sponsored CMAQ projects programmed for 2008, seven were obligated and 26 were likely to be obligate. The handout indicated that 16 projects did not meet the 80 percent match requirement for a difference in CMAQ funding of \$8.45 million. Finally, the handout indicated that 30 of 33 projects programmed under the 80 percent match were unlikely to or would not obligate in 2008.

At this point, Ms. Yazzie provided an overview of the work required in reprogramming projects to meet the 80 percent match, which included running air quality conformity analysis and obtaining approval of the reprogramming through the MAG Committee process. Then, Ms. Yazzie asked the Committee for their assistance in developing a strategies to address the issue. Potential ideas presented by Ms. Yazzie included the formation of a subcommittee of the Transportation Review Committee or of a Working Group. Ms. Yazzie also asked the Committee to discuss if the potential reprogramming should focus on projects programmed in 2008 and/or 2009 or for projects programmed from 2008 to 2012.

Mr. Moody inquired if the law required the 80 percent match for each work phase of the project. He provided an example of project funded at 100 percent with local funds for design and right-of-way acquisition and a minimum 80 percent CMAQ match for construction. Mr. Anderson replied that he believed jurisdictions could break out construction as a stand alone project. Discussion followed.

Several Committee members, including Mr. Moody and Mr. Grote, asked MAG staff to verify if jurisdictions could fund select work phases with CMAQ funds in lieu of funding all work phase related to the project. Mr. Anderson stated that MAG staff would contact FHWA to obtain clarification on the definition of a project. Discussion continued.

Mr. Meinhart inquired how the changes impacted the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Mr. Anderson explained that policies in the RTP establishing a 70 percent maximum match would need to be modified. Ms. Yazzie added that these policies apply to streets, ITS, and bicycle/pedestrian projects.

Mr. Anderson announced that one of the implications of the new provision was that MAG staff would be postponing the development of the 2009-2013 Transportation Improvement Program. He added that projects on the list to be included in a future TIP would not be removed. However, MAG staff believed it was prudent to address currently programmed projects before adding additional projects to the TIP. Discussion followed.

Mr. Meinhart suggested that the initial focus should be on projects programmed in 2008 while being cognizant of the impact on projects programmed in 2009-2012. He added that meetings should occur more frequently monthly in order to resolve the issue. Mr. Callow recommended that MAG staff establish a working group to address the issue, and Mr. David Fitzhugh from the City of Avondale concurred. Discussion continued.

In response to the discussion, Ms. Yazzie asked the Committee how frequently the working group should meet. Discussion followed, and the Committee agreed that meetings should occur on a weekly or bi-monthly basis. Next, Ms. Yazzie asked what specific information the Committee members and working group would need for future discussions. Several Committee members requested that the definition of a project be determined within the next week. Finally, Ms. Yazzie asked the Committee what the goals and priorities of the working group should be. Mr. Moody encouraged Ms. Yazzie to have the working group focus on 2008 projects at the first meeting before proceeding to 2009 projects.

In conclusion, Ms. Yazzie announced that a draft of the Federal Funding Programming Principles incorporating comments from the working group was available. Ms. Yazzie asked the Committee if she should disseminate the draft or wait until the CMAQ programming issue was addressed given the potential impact on the programming principles. Mr. Moody suggested that Ms. Yazzie wait, and the Committee concurred.

Ms. Yazzie inquired if there were any additional comments or questions about the agenda item. Mr. Lance Calvert from the City of El Mirage expressed confidence in the ability of MAG staff to find a resolution to this issue that would result in the completion of all of the currently programmed projects. Mr. Callow asked if there were any additional questions or comments.

There were none, and this concluded Ms. Yazzie's report.

6. 2007 MAG Internal Truck Travel Survey and Truck Model Development Study

Mr. Callow invited Ms. Lavanya Vallabhaneni from MAG to present on the 2007 MAG Internal Truck Travel Survey and Truck Model Development Study. Ms. Vallabhaneni thanked the Committee and explained that she was the project manager for the truck travel survey and truck model development study. She informed the Committee that the project was conducted from November 2006 to December 2007. Ms. Vallabhaneni stated the purpose of the study was to update the current truck travel model. The study area included Maricopa, Pinal, and Yavapai counties.

Ms. Vallabhaneni reported that MAG's truck model historically had been used as a key reference and case study by FHWA for their *Quick Response Freight Manual*. In conducting the 2007 study, MAG staff conducted a review of the existing truck model. The review included facilitated improvements to data collection techniques, trip generation, distribution and the assignment of trucks as well as a literature review on the current state of the practice. In addition, MAG staff reviewed state of the art truck travel modeling techniques.

Based on the review and a discussion of the pros and cons of multiple models, Ms. Vallabhaneni reported that the three-step truck modeling approach was recommended to improve the internal truck travel model. Generally, three vehicle classes are used: light (less than 8,000 lbs.), medium (8,001 to 28,000 lbs.), and heavy (more than 28,000 lbs.). However, the new model follows the FHWA vehicle configuration for modeling trucks. The FHWA vehicle classification stratified trucks into 13 classes:

- Light - FHWA Class 3 (2 axles with 4 tires);
- Medium – FHWA Class 5-7 (2 or more axles with 6 or more tires); and,
- Heavy - FHWA Class 8-13 (3 or more axles with 6 or more tires).

Ms. Vallabhaneni explained that the FHWA vehicle configuration was recommended because results could be compared directly to the vehicle classification count data.

At that point, Ms. Vallabhaneni invited Mr. Arun Kuppam from Cambridge Systematics to discuss the survey methodology used in greater detail. Mr. Kuppam reported that multiple data collection procedures were used for the study. Procedure types were geared towards specific sectors as travel behaviors varied between the different sectors. For the manufacturing and warehouse sectors, operator surveys were administered. This required contacting the drivers by phone at terminals and distribution centers. Truck trip diaries were used for delivery services, mail/parcel services, and construction and retail sectors. Drivers were asked to record the location and number of stops made during the day.

Then, Mr. Kuppam explained that data collection for safety services, utility companies, and the public sector was very difficult. As a result, data was gathered from a national databases. According to Mr. Kuppam, once data was collected, trip generation was determined by land use, production, and attraction. He added that a gravity model was used to analysis the data.

In conclusion, Mr. Kuppam summarized the findings of the Truck Travel Survey. He reported

that the use of multiple sample sources increased both response and eligibility rates. Of the data collection methods used, Mr. Kuppam stated that trip diaries were found to be the optimal method to obtain detailed trip data from sectors making numerous trips to various locations in a typical day. In addition, he reported that a comparison of the truck assignments from the new truck model against the counts validated well. Finally, he reported that heavy trucks trips occurred more often than medium truck trips.

After the presentation, Mr. Hauskins inquired why 30,000 lbs was used to differentiate between medium and heavy trucks. Mr. Kuppam responded that the weight of the vehicle was not used in the new model for classification purposes. Instead, the number of axles and tires on the truck were used to determine the proper classification. In closing, Ms. Vallabhaneni announced that the final report for the survey was available for download from transportation section of the MAG website.

Mr. Callow thanked Mr. Kuppam and Ms. Vallabhaneni for their presentation, and asked the Committee if there were any questions or comments on the agenda item. There were none, and this concluded Ms. Vallabhaneni's presentation.

7. Member Agency Update

Mr. Callow asked members of the Committee whether they would like to provide updates; address any issues or areas of concern regarding transportation at the regional level; and asked whether any members in attendance would like to address recent information that was relevant to transportation within their communities. There were none, and this concluded the Member Agency Update.

8. Next Meeting Date

Mr. Callow informed members in attendance that the next meeting of the Committee would be held on March 27, 2008. There being no further business, Mr. Callow adjourned the meeting at 11:15 p.m.